

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

And

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Regular Meeting

Monday 20 January 2014, 7:00 P.M., Live Oak School, 1978 Reche Road, Fallbrook
MINUTES

Mr. Russell called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Fourteen (14) members were present: Anne Burdick, Ike Perez, Roy Moosa, Tom Harrington, Paul Schaden, Jim Russell, Jerry Farrell, Jack Wood, Lee J. De Meo, Donna Gebhart, Ron Miller, Jean Dooley, Eileen Delaney and Jackie Heyneman. Michele Bain has resigned from the Group.

1. **Notice.** There is an opening on the Planning Group and Design Review Board for one elected member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors. If you are interested please e-mail your resume to the Group's secretary at Thomas.Harrington@sdcounty.ca.gov.
2. **Open Forum.** Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Planning Group on any subject matter within the Group's jurisdiction but not on today's agenda. Three minute limitation. Non-discussion, & Non-voting item.

Russell informed those present that Ms. Bain's seat on the Group was vacant and the Group would be considering an appointment later in the meeting and invited anyone interested to turn their resume before that item was considered in the meeting.

Ms. Delaney reported that the Land Use Performance Review Committee still had problems with a mission statement and was going back to the Board of Supervisors to clarify their assignment.

Mr. Wood informed those present that the Land Use Committee had a resignation of one non-elected member of the Committee and invited anyone present to apply for the position.

Ms. Delaney stated she also had an opening for a non-elected member of the Design Review Committee.

Ms. Heyneman stated that she also had an opening for a non-elected member of the Parks and Recreation Committee.

3. Approval of the minutes for the meetings of 16 December 2013. Voting Item.

Ms. Dooley motioned to approve the minutes as presented and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Presentation by Mr. Mark Massen, 858-966-1352, SD County Parks Sr. Project Manager, On the following two items. Continued from the 16 December 2013 meeting. **Parks and Recreation Committee.** Community input. Voting item.

1: Naming Rights for Park Amenities

2: Update of the Parks and Recreation Long Term Business Plan –(Updated Fee Ranges

Ms. Jill Bankston presented the proposed fund raising efforts that the Department of Parks and Recreation was proposing to take the Board of Supervisors for approval (set a hearing on January 29 and hold the hearing on February 5). The first being a fee increase for use charges. The Department staff had researched other agencies charges for use (Camping, day use, fishing, ect.). Staff was now going forward with asking the Board to authorize a window fee charges and

authorize the Director of Park and Recreation to increase fees as needed to a point of parody with other agencies providing similar services.

The second action the Department of Parks and Recreation was pursuing was setting up a program to allow park amenities (not the parks themselves) naming rights to be purchased. These rights would be limited in time (5 to 20 years) and the cost would vary from one amenity to another. The funds for this program would go into a Parks fund and be utilized for park improvements wherever needed at the discretion of the Director of Parks and Recreation.

Ms. Heyneman stated that the Fallbrook Community had stepped up when the County was having trouble maintaining its parks and kept Live Oak Park from being sold in the early 1990's. Still today the citizens of Fallbrook are very involved in our park and recreation facilities. She felt that raising funds for naming rights on park facilities that our community had saved and contributed to its maintenance then apply the funds outside the community was inappropriate.

Mr. Al Gebhart informed all present that private funds (\$503,000) had been raised and spent rebuilding the amphitheater at Live Oak Park. Allowing that facility to have its name sold would marginalize effort. Beyond the inequity of taking the naming rights funds and applying them wherever the Director of Parks and Recreation wanted, he felt the whole program ignored Fallbrook community efforts. He urged the Group to oppose the naming rights proposal.

After lengthy discussion Ms. Heyneman motioned to approve the proposed fee increases, But strongly opposed the entire naming rights program. The Motion passed unanimously.

5. TM5577 Berks Estates. Request to subdivide the 26.48 acres located at 1650 Winterhaven Road into 21 lots for 21 dwelling unit. Owner and applicant Jeffery S. Berk and Nancy B. Berk, 949-468-6448, berkjs@bv.com. Contact person Larry Paxton, 760-743-2461, Paxtonsurvey@yahoo.com. County planner Larry Hofreiter, (858) 694-8846, Larry.Hofreiter@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Land Use Committee**. Community input. Voting item. (11/6)

Mr. Bob Sukup (the engineer for the project) introduced the proposed subdivision of 26 acres into 21 lots west of Sunny Crest Drive. The subdivision proposed to access Winterhaven via Sunny Crest Drive.

Mr. Wood stated that the Land Use Committee had reviewed the project and spoken to some of the neighbors in the area and had concerns with the increased traffic at the Sunny Crest Dr and Winterhaven intersection.

Several property owners addressed the Group detailing the traffic hazard and evacuation problems Sunny Crest and Winterhaven posed for the 46 current homes along Sunny Crest. If both approved maps in the area are built out there will be 90 homes utilizing a hazardous intersection.

One resident suggested that a signal be considered at the intersection.

Mr. Farrell noted that there was a road easement along the westerly boundary of the subdivision going to Winterhaven. Mr. Sukup stated that road was not set to be constructed at this time.

Ms. Gebhart asked about trails and pathways in the development. Mr. Sukup stated that there would be a wide shoulder along the roads.

Several neighbor stated there was a lot of pedestrian traffic along Sunny Crest and subdivision appeared to provide no pedestrian improvements along Sunny Crest.

After lengthily discussion Mr. Wood motioned to continue the item to allow County Staff an opportunity to coordinate on the two developments in the area and provide some answers to the safety concerns voiced by the community. The motion passed unanimously.

6. MUP 13-021 Major Use Permit for Verizon Wireless to install 12 antennas, 21 remote radio units, and 1 microwave dish antenna on a new 55" high monobroadleaf on the 5.15 acres located at 1844 Winter Haven Road, (APN 106-300-36-00). Owner .Fallbrook United Methodist Church. Applicant

Verizon Wireless. Contact person Margie Sullivan 760-613-3488 or Ted Marioncelli, 760-807-1850, ted.plancom@sbcglobal.net. County planner: Marisa Smith, 858 694-2621, Marisa.Smith@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Public Facilities Committee**. Community input. Voting item. (12/16) POD 13-014 Property Zoning Cleanup Draft Changes Summary

Mr. Ted Marioncelli introduced the request. He informed the Group that wireless provider was working closely with the property owner and County to place the tower in an area of the Churches improved site. There were several conflicts on the site but Mr. Marioncelli was confident they could be dealt with.

Mr. Moosa reported that the Facilities Committee had reviewed the request and approved it subject to the County concerns being addressed.

The Group had concerns with proximity of residential property and it was estimated at a quarter mile away.

After limited discussion Mr. Moosa motioned to approve the request as submitted subject to County approval. The Motion passed unanimously.

7. POD 13-014 Property Zoning Cleanup 2013. County planner Carl Stiehl, 858.694.2216, carl.stiehl@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Land Use Committee**. Community input. Voting item. (12/19)

Building Type Changes

Sub-Area No. FA-BT-1 Old Building Type W. Proposed building type L APN 1043514700. Address Rockycrest Road, (south west corner of Rockycrest and south Mission Roads). Owner Chaffin. General Plan Land Use Designations: General Commercial

Sub-Area No FA-BT-2 Old Building Type F. Proposed building type K. APNs 1041323500, 1041324300, 1041324400. Address, Old Stage Road (north west corner of E. Aviation and Old Stage Roads). Owners: Fallbrook Village Aviation LLC. General Plan Land Use Designations: Village Residential VR-15

Discussion: Property owner requests from representative Lee & Associates to Change the building type from "W" which allows no residential uses, to a staff recommended "L" to allow for mixed use on area NO.1. As the existing zone is C34 Commercial Residential Use Regulations, which is a mixed use zone, a building type allowing both residential and commercial buildings should be instituted with the General Plan Update. This was an oversight from the Update and the building type should have changed back then in 2011. An additional request to change from "F" to "K" in a residential zone RV Variable Family Residential is on area No.2. This would be a more flexible building type to allow development of the parcels with an existing density of 15 from the General Plan Update. The building type of "F" would necessitate a subdivision of the property to reach full yield in density. The building type of "K" would allow other patterns of development which may not require a subdivision for development.

No additional dwelling units would be allowed under either scenario than what was already approved in the General Plan Update, the change in building type for each would allow for a more flexible pattern of development for the parcels as requested.

Mr. Wood introduced this request change the zoning on two lots that designated as commercial only in the General Plan update instead of the Residential Commercial zoning of surrounding lots. County Staff now wanted to clean this up. Mr. Wood motioned to approve the zone change correction and the motion passed unanimously.

8. Request for a waiver of the Site plan requirement for a 22 Sq.Ft. sign of internally illuminated channel letters, 15" in height to be located on the Eave face edge located at 1374 Mission Ave. on the El Tigre

Grocery Store, apn 104-201-22-00. Owner El Tigre Grocery Store, Sharri Sesslib 760-594-4907. Contact person Incha Lockhart 760-736-6070, incha@westernsign.com. County planner Debra Frischer 858.495.5201, debra.frischer@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Design Review Committee**. Community input. Voting item. (12/20)

Ms. Delaney introduced the item stating that the Design Review Committee had reviewed the request and had agreed to 12" letters up to 15 Sq. Ft. sign. But there was concern that the Center had several illegal & un-permitted signs, the market had storage of product, boxes & sales outside, which is not allowed in C36. After limited discussion in which Chairman Russell stated that he could not approve a new sign when the Center had existing violations, Ms. Delaney motioned deny the request until the other violations on the site were addressed. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Request for a waiver of the Site Plan requirements for a sign renovation program for the Fallbrook Mercantile Center located at the south west corner of Main Avenue and Fallbrook Street. Contact person John Panuzzo, (858) 569-1400 x 4115, gpanuzzo@ultrasigns.com. County planner Debra Frischer 858.495.5201, debra.frischer@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Design Review Committee**. Community input. Voting item. (12/20)

Mr. Panuzzo introduced the request. He stated that his client really wanted 18" letters to match the other signs in the shopping center.

Ms. Delaney stated the other signs in the center were existing non-conforming and were built prior to the enactment of the DR Guidelines in 1989. The current sign ordinance dictates letters that are 8" in height. . She felt the Design Review Committee recommendation for 15" letters was more than generous.

After limited discussion Ms. Delaney motioned to approve the signage with 15" letters and total sign dimensions not to exceed 40 Sq. Ft. The motion passed with Mr. Perez abstaining.

10. Revisions to the Campus Park West Specific Plan documents The link to the EIR, which has not been revised, is: <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/ceqa/GPA05003-SP05001-REZ05005-TM5424-HLPXXXXX.html> . The Planning and Development Services Department is requesting a final recommendation on the project and requests that the FCPG hear it at our January 2014 meetings. Contact person Camille Passon, (619) 881-3464, camillep@projectdesign.com. County planner Dennis Campbell, 858.505.6380, dennis.campbell@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Land Use, Circulation, Parks & Recreation and Design Review Committees**. Community input. Voting item. (12/20)

Mr. Chris Brown introduced the request. He went through the overview of the project and the status of the EIR. He stated that the project had changed little but the developer and their consultants had completed preparing responses to all of the comments on the EIR. The Developer hoped to have the EIR with all comments addressed and back into the County's hands within the next few months. At that time (after a short public review period) the County would be considering accepting the EIR and approving the project.

Mr. Wood stated the Land Use Committee had reviewed the project and still had the following concerns.

- **Concern – Is the commercial neighborhood or regional? – documentation states that it will not conflict with Fallbrook Proper commerce. Big Box stores?**

- **Commercial segments sold separately? Will each then come back to FCPG for compliance?**
- **Discussion of the pros and cons of Smart Growth.**
- > **Proposed commercial would compete rather than compliment Fallbrook Proper. To enhance the area and compliment Fallbrook all commercial opportunities must be neighborhood.**

Ms. Burdick stated that the Circulation Committee had reviewed this and still had the following concerns which Mr. Brown had provided the following answers.

1) THE LACK OF IMPROVEMENTS TO PALA MESA BRIDGE: Members had serious concerns about the inadequacy of the bridge and its “T” connection to Pankey Road. Even with a signal installed at the intersection of Highway 395, the traffic will still queue onto the bridge and back up as far as Pankey Road, creating a bottle-neck in and out of the Campus Park West project.

Mr. Brown explained their Traffic Engineer had reviewed the traffic study and traffic projections and found no reason for the concern.

2) THE CREATION OF PANKEY PLACE AS A SUBSTITUTE EAST-WEST CONNECTOR BETWEEN HORSE RANCH CREEK ROAD AND PALA MESA DRIVE. While the Committee recognizes the over-riding issue of sensitive habitat, the members had always hoped that a direct connection between Pala Mesa Drive and Horse Ranch Creek would one day be possible. The lack of a direct connection will have a significant impact on general congestion and fire response times to all the projects east of Interstate 15.

The Developer had re-visited the issue and told by the regulatory environmental agencies that the Groups desired alignment would never be approved.

3) The cul-de-sac at the north end of Pankey Road does not meet county standards and creates only one ingress and egress for the industrial park. What secondary access is available for the industrial area in the event of a closure at Pankey Road and Pala Mesa Drive?

Mr. Broun informed the Committee that due to the short length of the road a secondary access was not required by County Planning or Public Safety sections.

4) What is the purpose of the right-in, right-out intersection on Pankey Road approximately 320 feet north of Pankey Place? This would infer that truck traffic, in fact all traffic accessing whatever area is being serviced by this intersection, would have to enter Campus Park West via Pala Mesa Bridge. That issue had been raised in 2008 and deleted from consideration in 2010. How is this circulation concept different from prior proposals?

This access was provided as an additional access to the southerly portion of the Commercial center. Traffic would also have access to the three signalized north of the Right in right out access that also serve the center.

5) The bike route data is confusing because the street design maps indicating Class II and Class III bike routes do not match the Circulation Plan map or the written descriptions. Figure II-11 shows Pankey Road North of SR-76 as a Class III bike route, but Figure II-9 shows it as a Class II bike route. The GPA description says it would....”amend the ME to reclassify Pankey Road....with Class II bike facilities from Pala Mesa Drive to Shearer Crossing” and does not mention Pankey Drive north of Pala Mesa Drive.

(Also, Figure 1-14 in the DESEIR shows proposed off-site roadway improvements on a 2010 On-site Circulation map.)

Mr. Brown and Ms. Passon noted the conflict in the typical section drawings but assured the Committee that the bike ways still met County Class II route standards.

6) The volume of traffic resulting from this development will create bottlenecks at both access points: the southern access at Highway 76 and the western access at Old Highway 395. All the traffic to and from this development will need to use one of these two intersections for ingress and egress.

Mr. Brown stated the traffic Engineer once again reviewed the report and the concern and felt the proposed circulation roads and signalization would be sufficient.

7) There was concern about freeway traffic noise affecting the residential areas. The walls suggested in the EIR appear inadequate and unsightly.

Mr. Brown stated the noise reduction features of the development are County requirements. He also stated that the project landscaper would add features to soften the buffer.

8) Shared parking seems inadequate based on the data presented. Parking requirements for the multi housing units should at minimum equal the requirements for single family homes because in most developments such as this there is always a shortage of parking. Parking provisions today do not reflect the reality of high density developments.

While the developer was reviewing the design to look for any additional parking possible the project had exceeded the County minimum requirements.

9) There was concern about the “significant traffic impacts” listed in the EIR. Most of the solutions for these were resolved by stating that Traffic Impact Fees would be paid. The committee felt that this answer did not adequately clarify what exactly would be done to resolve these “significant” issues. What are the specific solutions?

Ms. Passon stated that the impacts of the project were being addressed by the combination on on-site, off-site and TIF fees. This approach was being driven and approved by the County Planning staff.

10) A Diamond Interchange for I-15 at Stewart Canyon would greatly improve most of the traffic problems created by the developments east of I-15.

Mr. Brown stated that he appreciated the Group's desire for another intersection along the I-15, it was entirely a Caltrans issue.

11) The long-requested transportation node for the developments east of I-15 should be located in the Campus Park West project. The existence of a Park and Ride across the freeway is of little value to the residents, merchants, and customers east of the I-15.

Mr. Brown stated that the location of the traffic node had been designed into the I-15 bridge project and that full bus service would provide access from the Campus Park West project and all of the future development east of I-15 to the facility.

12) The roads in the commercial/shopping areas should be built to Public Road standards in order to provide adequate access and to eliminate excessive congestion.

While the circulation roads within the development would be built to County public standards and maintained by the County, roads within a commercial and residential development would meet a privately maintained County road standard.

13) There is a great deal missing from these documents. Where is the on-site circulation plan? How do the described intersections feed into the road network of the various component areas? Where are the buildings located? What is the phasing of the project?

Committee members wondered why the project is coming to us now when so much of the information appears incomplete.

Mr. Brown and Ms. Passon informed the Committee that additional information would be provided with the final EIR review. But in this type of development site maps for the individual developments would come along when construction permits were being issued. Mr. Brown stated that the realistic schedule for the development would be to possibly pull building permits in 2020.

Ms. Delaney stated that the Design Review Committee had reviewed the project and noted that the building heights had been reduced to acceptable limits but was waiting to see site plans for further comment. Mr. Brown assured her that as the site developed site plans would be coming to the Planning Group for review.

The Design Review Committee voted to recommend approval subject to the following:

1. Chapter 6 II- 103. WALL SIGN AREA

General Commercial- Signs should be no more than 50% of the architectural building element on which it is placed.

Industrial - Signs should be less than 50% of the architectural building element on which it is placed.

2. Figure 1-9, Appendix B

More trees & shrubs should be used along the I-15 to reduce the visual impact of the project.

Ms. Heyneman stated that Parks and Recreation had reviewed the project and was please with the reduction green rooftops being applied to recreational requirements.

Mr. Harry Christensen stated he had concerns that the overall impact of all of the developments east of I-15 were not being dealt with. Mr. Dennis Campbell (County Planning Staff) informed the Group that as the projects developed infrastructure improvement would be required.

After further discussion Ms. Delaney motioned to approve the project subject to review of all of the answers to the Groups concerns in the final EIR. The Motion passed unanimously.

11. Request for authorization to open a used car sale business at 208 W. Aviation, Fallbrook Auto Connection. Applicant Dan Katje, 760-728-6482, socalpool@yahoo.com. **Design Review Committee**. Community input. Voting item.

The applicant introduced the request. Ms. Delaney stated the Design Review Committee had reviewed the request and proposed signage and had no problems with the project. After limited discussion Ms. Delaney motioned to approve the request as presented and the motion passed unanimously.

12. MUP14-001 Request for a Major Use Permit from Verizon Wireless, 858-694-3029 for a unmanned telecommunication site at 5045 Olive Hill Road consisting of 12 antennas, 12 remote radio units, and 1 microwave dish antenna on a new 55' high faux eucalyptus. The equipment necessary to operate the facility will be located in a proposed 22' x 12' stick built building. Installation of an emergency generator will be inside a 12' x 14' concrete block wall enclosure. Owner Black Family Triust. Contact person Margie Sullivan 760-613-3488. County planner Lisa Sims 858-694-3029. **Public Facilities Committee**. Community input. Voting item.

Item continued at the applicant's request.

13. There is an opening on the Planning Group and Design Review Board for one elected member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors. If you are interested please e-mail your resume to the Group's secretary at Thomas.Harrington@sdcounty.ca.gov Discussion and voting on a recommendation to fill that position. Community input. Voting item.

Mr. Russell introduced the item stating that three candidates (Ms. Teresa Platt, Mr. Jerry Kalman and Mr. Bill McCarthy) had submitted resume's to apply for the position (attached). Mr. Russell invited them to speak to the Group. After their presentations Mr. Harrington Took roll of each Group member requesting each to vote for the candidate of their choice. The voting tally was as follows:

Ms. Platt 1 Vote

Mr. Kalman 3 Votes

Mr. McCarthy 8 Votes

Since only eight votes were needed for nomination Mr. McCarthy was nominated. M. Harrington was directed to forward Mr. McCarthy's resume and application to the County for Board of Supervisor approval.

14. Election of officers, Chairman, 1st Vice Chair, 2nd Vice Chair, and Secretary. Voting item

Mr. Russell turned the chair over to the Mr. Harrington (the secretary) who opened nominations for Chair. Ms. Burdick nominated Mr. Russell. Nominations were closed and Mr. Russell's nomination approved.

Mr. Harrington turned the chair back to Mr. Russell opened nominations for 1st Vice Chair. Mr. De Meo nominated Mr. Wood. Nominations were closed and the nomination approved.

Mr. Russell opened the nominations for 2nd Vice Chair. Ms. Gebhart nominated Mr. Moosa. Nominations were closed and the nomination approved.

Mr. Russell opened nominations for Secretary. Ms. Delaney nominated Mr. Harrington. Nominations were closed and the nomination approved.

The Meeting was adjourned at 9:29 pm
Tom Harrington, Secretary